

Dear Commissioners,

I finally got a chance to read through the full We Will Chicago draft today! Overall it's a great piece of planning. The document has a clear sense of structural challenges facing Chicago, and some of the data visualizations were quite convicting. I look forward to helping achieve the outlined objectives in the short and long term. I would however share what I hope are constructive pieces of feedback. Please forgive me if I include all of these thoughts on one email:

- Pg. 10: Including public housing among the structural injustices in Chicago's history. 100% true in terms of it's siting and maintenance, but it was odd to place something that should conceptually be a good thing between redlining and urban renewal.
- Pg. 12: Is there space to include the late 2007-2014 foreclosure crisis in these structural issues? Arguably it had a direct impact on the proliferation of vacant lots and loss of wealth across Black and Brown communities.
- Pg. 39 and throughout: would it make sense, in the final plan, to include the ward maps while be using from here forward? Could be important for the long-term viability of the plan politically.
- Pg. 43: is there a reason we don't have poverty and homelessness data from 2020 or 2021?
- Pg. 48: I feel like there is a need to dig into *why* Black and Latino households don't use traditional banks. It feels essential to achieving our objectives.
- Pg. 50: *How* will we achieve the availability of quality, affordable commercial space? (Overall, the how of these objectives is something I wish we had more space for)
- Pg. 51: *Why* are Blacks and Latinos so underrepresented as business owners? Also, in the data table, does the Total (line 5) include Latinos (line 6) under White (line 1)?
- Pg. 53: unemployment table on this page, but throughout: it feels like there is an under-emphasizing of inequities facing Latinos, which may not be as great as those facing Black Chicagoans but are still quite dramatic.
- Pg. 68: 5.1 "Significantly reduce the ongoing impact of climate change in our neighborhoods" is a very broad objective. Is there a way to break that down into more achievable aspects?
- Pg. 68: In the table on building-related emissions, what comprises "Other"? Knowing that 70% of our emissions are building-related, can we have an explicit decarbonization related objective?
- Pg. 72: I would encourage a re-thinking of the "all 77 community areas" language around housing. It feels like it glosses over the need for equitable housing placement and preservation and the work of affirmatively furthering fair housing.
- Pg. 75: Were the lending denials categorized by the race/ethnic identity of the applicant or the community area?
- Pg. 79: Measuring "Community belonging" is fascinating, but how have described it, asked the question? It would be interesting to see racial/ethnic disparities in community belonging in gentrifying communities.
- Pg. 99: I'm hoping we can note the dramatic disparity for Latinos in uninsured rate.
- Pg. 113: How do we define "low stress bikeways"? What is being measured in the 146 mile baseline? Miles of total bikeways?
- Pg. 114-15: What objectives can we look at for the decarbonization of transportation?
- The Plan Implementation page is only a half page of text. Can that be fleshed out?
- Generally, are there measurable outcomes to accompany our objectives, pillars?

I know that's a lot! It's only because 1) I love what we're trying to achieve and 2) I want the plan to be as successful as possible! If you're creating spaces for alders to engage with the plan I would love to participate!

Kind regards,

Daniel

Daniel La Spata

Alderman | 1<sup>st</sup> Ward  
1958 N. Milwaukee Ave. | Chicago, IL 60647